

**REMARKS**

Applicants' representative would like to thank Examiner Brown for courtesies extended during telephonic interviews on June 7, 2005, September 22, 2005, and September 28, 2005. During the interview on June 7, 2005, Applicants noted to the Examiner that the finality of the Office Action is in error, directing the Examiner to Section 706.07(b) of the MPEP. The Examiner agreed to withdraw the finality of the rejection upon request. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the finality of the rejection be withdrawn based on Section 706.07(b) of the MPEP.

During the interviews of September 22, 2005 and September 28, 2005, the Examiner clarified the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and noted that Claims 2 and 3 appear to contain allowable subject matter. Accordingly, Applicants have amended independent Claim 1 to include the elements of dependent Claim 3. Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 1 is in condition for allowance.

Claims 1-2 and 4-17 are now pending in the application. By this paper, Claims 1 and 2 have been amended. The basis for these amendments can be found throughout the specification, claims, and drawings originally filed. No new matter has been added. The preceding amendments and the following remarks are believed to be fully responsive to the outstanding Office Action and are believed to place the application in condition for allowance.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

**REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1 and 4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Imamura et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,758,521).

This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Imamura teaches a monitor (60) rotatably mounted to a *side* surface of a seatback (11b) and includes a "side seat" mounting base section (19). See Imamura at FIGS. 1 and 2. The monitor is rotatably supported by a pivoting support section (15) having a rotation support section (16) that is able to be rotated about a vertical axis. See Imamura at Col. 5, Ins. 1-9 and FIG.4. The display screen is rotated about the vertical axis between a stowed position and a use position and is not pivotally attached to a *rear* surface of a vehicle seat (i.e., a surface of a seatback generally opposite a seating surface of the seatback) by a support arm. In addition, Imamura does not teach stowing the display screen in a housing disposed on a rear surface of a vehicle seat when in the stowed position. Rather, the display screen of Imamura is simply rotated 90 degrees from a use position and into a stowed position, such that the display screen generally faces a side surface of the vehicle seat.

In contrast, the present invention discloses a display assembly having a support arm rotatably connected to a rear surface of a seatback at a seat end and rotatably and pivotally connected to a display screen at a display end. The display screen is rotatably mounted such that in a use position, the screen faces away from a rear surface of the vehicle seat and is viewable by occupants seated generally behind the vehicle seat. In a stowed position, the display screen and support arm are movable both at an attachment location of the support arm to the rear surface (i.e., at the seat end of the

support arm) of the seatback and at a connection point of the display screen to the support arm (i.e., at the display end of the support arm) to allow the display screen to be received by a housing mounted to the rear surface of the seatback.

Because Imamura fails to teach a display screen mounted to a rear surface of a vehicle seat, and, further because Imamura fails to teach stowing a display screen in a housing disposed on a rear surface of a vehicle seat, Applicants respectfully submit that Imamura fails to teach each and every element of the present invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claim 1, as well as Claim 4, dependent therefrom, are in condition for allowance. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

#### **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 2, 3, and 5-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Imamura et al. in view of Shichijo et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,000,511) and Buono (U.S. Publication No. US 2003/0057749 A1)).

This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent Claim 1 is believed to be in condition for allowance in light of the remarks contained above. Because Claims 2 and 5-17 depend from independent Claim 1, dependant Claims 2 and 5-17 should similarly be in a condition for allowance for at least the same reasons. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Notwithstanding the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that dependent Claim 6 is not taught or suggested by the combination of Imamura, Shichijo, and Buono.

Specifically, Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Imamura, Shichijo, and Buono fails to teach a first universal joint connecting a seat end of a support arm to a rear surface of a vehicle seat such that the support arm may be pivoted at the junction of the support arm and the rear surface of the vehicle seat. Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Imamura, Shichijo, and Buono fails to teach a second universal joint connecting a display end of the support arm to a display screen such that the display screen may be rotated and pivoted at the junction of the display end and the display screen.


Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections.

#### CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Final Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this response is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 944-6526.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 9/29/05

By:   
Matthew H. Szalach, Reg. No. 53,665  
(248) 944-6526  
Attorney for Applicants

Ralph E. Smith  
CIMS 483-02-19  
DaimlerChrysler Intellectual Capital Company LLC  
DaimlerChrysler Technology Center  
800 Chrysler Drive  
Auburn Hills, MI 48326-2757  
248-944-6519